

REMARKS

Claims 1-23, 26-28, 30-78, 81, 82, and 84-111 were previously pending.

Claims 1-20, 36-43, 45-75, 90-96, and 98-111, which are directed to the Group I invention as per the Restriction Requirement of June 29, 2007, have been cancelled without prejudice to pursue in a divisional application.

As such, claims 21-23, 26-28, 30-35, 44, 76-78, 81, 82, 84-89 and 97 are currently pending.

Claims 21-23, 26-28, 32-35, 44, 76-78, 81, 82, 86-89 and 97 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 7,118,693 (“Glatkowski”). Claims 30 and 84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Glatkowski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,908,585 (“Shibuta I”). Claims 31 and 85 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Glatkowski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,853,877 (“Shibuta II”). Applicants respectfully traverse each of these rejections.

Contrary to the Office Action, Glatkowski does not teach or suggest the specific milling limitation as recited in Applicants’ lone independent claim 21. In fact, Glatkowski does not teach or suggest any milling step at all for any purpose. As cited by the Office Action, Glatkowski teaches the use of a ultrasonic homogenizer to disperse the carbon nanotubes in solvents. (Col. 10, lines 40-67). An ultrasonic homogenizer uses ultrasound waves to disperse carbon nanotubes. This is not the same as milling, which is a mechanical process that requires a milling machine. Indeed, Applicants’ claims 21 and 23 and teachings at p. 23, lines 13-p. 24, line 2 confirm that sonication and milling are two different steps.

Furthermore, it noted that the Office Action did not provide any evidence or art to support that “it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to substitute a filtering means as a functional equivalent of centrifuge.” As such, this ground for rejection

cannot be maintained. MPEP 706.02(j). The complete absence of any art to support this statement confirm that it would not be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to substitute filtering for centrifuging.

Shibuta I and Shibuta II fail to make up for these deficiencies. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims 21-23, 26-28, 30-35, 44, 76-78, 81, 82, 84-89 and 97 are allowable and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

No fees are believed due in connection with the filing of this Amendment. However, if any additional fees are necessary, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0540.

Dated: January 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Albert B. Chen/
Albert B. Chen, Reg. No. 41,667
Barry Evans, Reg. No. 22,802
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
1177 Avenue of Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 715-9100 Tel
(212) 715 8000 Fax